

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5, 16, 33, 35 and 36 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-32, 34 and 37-43 have been cancelled without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,901,327 (hereinafter "Ofek").

The Applicants have amended the independent claims remaining in the application. On August 23, 2005 a telephonic interview between the undersigned attorney for the Applicant and Examiner took place in which the claims were discussed. During this discussion, the Examiner has indicated that incorporating the limitations of dependent claim 3 and any intervening claims into independent claim 1 would make independent claim 1 novel and non-obvious over Ofek. To expedite issuance of claims, the Applicant has amended claim 1 and the independent claims to include the limitations of claim 3 and any intervening claims.

To that end, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. Similarly, claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 6 and 7. Similarly, claim 16 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 17 and 18. Similarly, claim 33 has been amended to include the limitations similar to those of claims 2 and 3. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to require that "wherein the second request and the first message each

include a respective message identification field, and respective message identification fields in the second request and the first message contain identical message identification values.”

Ofek does not teach or suggest this limitation. The section of Ofek cited by the Examiner to reject former claim 3 concerns various commands and command fields. However, Ofek does not teach or suggest a message identification field, and furthermore does not teach or suggest that the “respective message identification fields in the second request and the first message contain identical message identification values.”

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Ofek. All independent claims contain limitations similar to those of allowable claim 1. Thus, all other independent claims are also allowable. Furthermore, all dependent claims adding limitations to allowable independent claims are also allowable. Thus, all claims remaining in the application are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, in view of European Patent EP 1 150 210 A2 (hereinafter “Tabuchi”).

The Examiner does not purport that Tabuchi teaches or suggests the limitation that “wherein the second request and the first message each include a respective message identification field, and respective message identification

fields in the second request and the first message contain identical message identification values."

In fact Tabuchi does not teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Ofek in view of Tabuchi. All independent claims contain limitations similar to those of allowable claim 1. Thus, all other independent claims are also allowable. Furthermore, all dependent claims adding limitations to allowable independent claims are also allowable. Thus, all claims remaining in the application are in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

Applicant(s) respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Adam Furst at (408) 947-8200.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN


Adam Furst
Reg. No. 51,710

Date: August 24, 2005

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200